DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 584 CS 200 717

AUTHOR	Hulteng, John L.
TITLE	What Editors and Journalism Educators Expect from Journalism Education; An ANPA News Research Center Survey. News Research Bulletin No. 12.
INSTITUTION	American Newspaper Publishers Association, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	16 Sep 71
NOTE	28p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	College Majors; College Teachers; *Employment Qualifications; Higher Education; *Journalism; *National Surveys; *Professional Training; *Transfer of Training
IDENTIFIERS	*Journalism Education

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this survey was to assemble data about the expectations of editors and journalism educators as to journalism education, with the objective of providing a basis for an informed dialogue about ways to advance and support education for journalism. Some of the findings were: editors much less than educators perceived newly-hired graduates as having an adequate understanding of newsroom principles; newly-hired graduates' journalistic skills were evaluated much higher by educators than by editors, and school administrators evaluated the graduates' skills considerably higher than did the teachers; more than one-half of the editors who claimed to know, overestimated highly the proportion of the student's program that is devoted to courses in journalism, and five out of eight underestimated the proportion of liberal arts courses taken by the journalism student. (LL)

AMERICAN NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION
STANFORD SMITH, *President and General Manager*
750 Third Ave., New York, N.Y. 10017

News Research Bulletin No. 12 Sept. 16, 1971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 083584

What Editors and Journalism Educators Expect from Journalism Education

An ANPA News Research Center Survey

conducted by

Prof. John L. Hulteng

University of Oregon

CS 300 717

Survey Compares Editors', Educators' Expectations As to Journalism Schools' Functions, Performance

For the purpose of developing a basis for an informed dialogue about education for journalism, the ANPA News Research Center last spring commissioned Professor John L. Hulteng, of the University of Oregon, to survey samples of editors and of journalism school educators to compare their expectations as to the functions, goals and performance of the schools.

Professor Hulteng is a former chief editorial writer for the Providence (R.I.) *Journal* and *Bulletin*, a former dean of the School of Journalism at Oregon, and at one time served as president of the American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism.

Some of his findings were:

- Editors much less than educators perceived newly-hired graduates as having an adequate understanding of newsroom principles.
- Newly-hired graduates' journalistic skills were evaluated much higher by educators than by editors, and school administrators evaluated the graduates' skills considerably higher than did the teachers.
- More than one-half of the editors who claimed to know overestimated highly the proportion of the student's program that is devoted to courses in journalism and five out of eight underestimated the proportion of liberal arts courses taken by the journalism student.

By JOHN L. HULTENG

Occasionally editors or publishers assert, in print or in talks at annual association meetings, that journalism educators are not doing the kind of job they ought to be doing with their student charges. And the educators, in their journals and at their meetings, sometimes contend that the professionals in the field have a distorted view of the role of education for journalism.

Such charges and counter-charges are often couched in general terms; they rarely deal in specifics. They frequently refer to polarizations that are assumed to be characteristic of the field, and that by repeated citation have come to be stereotypes: liberal arts emphasis *vs.* technique courses, chi square researchers *vs.* green-eyeshade pros. Or the exchanges may focus on a single journalism education program at a single institution, holding it (and its flaws or its virtues) up as representative of all the field. There have been few efforts made to determine on any systematic and large-scale basis to what extent the views of editors and educators may differ or correspond.

Why Yet Another Study?

The purpose of the study discussed in this report was to assemble data about the expectations of editors and educators as to journalism education, with the objective of providing a basis for an informed dialogue about ways to advance and to support education for journalism.

Since the respondents were to be asked to give their views about the nature, purpose, and accomplishments of programs in journalism education, it was recognized that the results would reflect estimates and approximations, rather than precise findings of fact. But it was expected that the data would serve to sketch the outlines of the *picture* the perception, that a representative group of editors had of journalism education, and the corresponding picture or perception held by a representative group of educators. Discovering the similarities and the discrepancies between these two pictures could be a first step toward improving understanding and cooperation on the part of both groups.

A detailed questionnaire was drafted by the author (at that time serving as a visiting professor at the Department of Communication at Stanford University) in consultation with Dr. Chilton R. Bush, director of the ANPA News Research Center.

The draft was sent to four leading editors and four experienced journalism educators for their evaluation and comment, and their suggestions were reflected in the final version of the questionnaire.

That final version was printed in two forms - one designed to be sent to editors, the other to educators. The two forms were kept as nearly identical as possible, so as to make comparisons valid when the results were tabulated. The response categories were exactly alike in the two forms; the wording of some of the questions had to be changed slightly from one form to the other to fit the circumstances. Both forms contained 18 basic questions and response sets; the questionnaire designed for editors contained two additional questions not related to the basic purpose of the study (one asked for the circulation size of the respondent's paper, the other asked for the editor's estimate of the value of journalism educators as professional consultants to newspapers.)

The Sample

The sample of newspaper editors was made up of all the 335 names on the Associated Press Managing Editors Association's membership list (excluding duplicate memberships from a single paper.) Responses were received from 191, or 57%. Since 9 of the responses were not usable (they were in the form of letters, and thus could not be tabulated, or they consisted of a blank questionnaire and an explanatory note) the total number of usable responses was 182, or 54% of the original sample. There were responses from the District of Columbia and from all of the 47 states in which there were APME members except Alaska, Hawaii, Nevada and New Hampshire. So far as circulation categories were concerned, the responses corresponded fairly well with the makeup of the sample, except that papers with circulations of less than 25,000 (17%) were somewhat under-represented and papers with circulations of more than 100,000 (36%) were somewhat over-represented.

The educator sample consisted of 247 names and included educators from three groups. First, administrators of all of the 58 accredited schools and departments were included. To these were added 96 members of the Theory and Methodology Division and 93 members of the Newspaper Division of the Association for Education in Journalism, the academic organization to which most journalism educators belong. Selection of the names of the division members was by a systematic method. Responses were received from 164

of the 247 persons in the educator sample (66%) and all were usable.

The Findings - a Mixed Bag

The data produced by the survey were revealing in various ways. In the case of some questions, valid comparisons could be made between the pattern of responses from editors and that from educators. These comparisons suggested some significant differences in the views held by the two groups as to the nature and function of journalism education programs.

The responses to some of the other questions did not lend themselves as well to direct comparisons, since one group or the other indicated a high "don't know" category. Editors responded with a high proportion of "don't knows" when asked about their impressions of the detailed makeup of a journalism student's course program; educators made high "don't know" responses to questions that asked about the kind and quantity of financial support provided to their schools by newspapers. Even though they did not constitute as useful a basis for direct comparisons, the questions that drew numerous "don't know" responses did pinpoint areas in which exchange of information between editors and educators would be helpful. The responses to eight of the questions are not reported here.

All data are presented in collapsed tables, and on the basis of "all editor" and "all educator" groupings. Where significant differences appeared among the responses of the various circulation groups in the editor sample, or between the administrator and the professor components in the educator sample, such differences are noted in the explanatory comments.

How Well Prepared for the Newsroom?

Some of the questions that produced the most directly comparable results had to do with the impressions held by the editors and the educators as to the degree to which graduates of journalism education programs were prepared to fill jobs in the newspaper field.

Educators showed far greater optimism about the level of preparation of their graduates than did the editors, both in terms of general principles of newspapering and in terms of specific job skills.

Question 1 asked (in the editors' version): *In your experience with newly-hired graduates of journalism education programs, what degree of understanding do they have of the following:* and in the educators' version, *What degree of un-*

derstanding do you think the graduates of your journalism program have of: The responses are listed in Table 1[a].

TABLE 1

Editors' and Educators' Evaluations of Graduates' Knowledge of Newsroom Principles

What understanding do journalism graduates have of:	A great deal or Quite a lot	Some	Little or Hardly any
Objectivity in Reporting:			
Editors	51.7%	41.2%	6.6%
Educators	86.6%	9.8%	3.1%
The function of advertising as economic mainstay of the press:			
Editors	23.7%	41.8%	34.1%
Educators	48.1%	40.3%	6.2%
Reporter-news source relationships:			
Editors	34.6%	48.9%	14.3%
Educators	75.6%	20.2%	1.8%
Reporter-editor relationships:			
Editors	45.1%	44.0%	9.9%
Educators	61.0%	32.3%	5.5%
Function of newspaper style books:			
Editors	36.8%	39.6%	20.4%
Educators	68.3%	26.2%	3.1%
Reporter-advertiser relationships:			
Editors	3.8%	36.3%	55.8%
Educators	22.0%	44.5%	28.6%
Editorializing in news copy:			
Editors	29.6%	47.3%	22.5%
Educators	79.2%	17.1%	2.4%
Journalism ethics:			
Editors	55.5%	33.0%	14.3%
Educators	83.5%	12.8%	2.4%
Prevailing salary scales:			
Editors	50.4%	30.2%	14.3%
Educators	46.3%	46.3%	6.1%

Question 2 inquired as to the graduates' skills. The editors' version of the question was:*In your experience with graduates of programs in journalism education, how well-prepared have you found them to be to do the following, with only minimal on-the-job training in local newsroom proce-*

[a] "Don't know" responses have been omitted from the table. They range from .4% to 4.9%.

dures: The educators' version was: *How well do you think your graduates are prepared to do the following, with only minimal on-the-job training in local newsroom procedures:* Table 2 shows the responses[b]

TABLE 2

Editors' and Educators' Evaluation of Graduates' Skills

How well prepared are journalism graduates to:	Very well prepared or well prepared	Somewhat prepared	Poorly or very poorly prepared
Write usable news copy:			
Editors	49.0%	47.8%	3.2%
Educators	87.2%	9.8%	.6%
Handle a copy-editing or head writing assignment			
Editors	11.5%	48.4%	39.0%
Educators	71.3%	22.6%	4.3%
Write interpretive or feature stories:			
Editors	33.6%	53.3%	12.6%
Educators	72.6%	23.8%	1.8%
Recognize news values in a speech or meeting story:			
Editors	33.5%	52.7%	13.8%
Educators	82.3%	14.0%	1.8%
Obtain and report facts accurately:			
Editors	50.0%	44.0%	5.5%
Educators	81.7%	13.4%	2.4%
Cover a news situation comprehensively:			
Editors	20.9%	54.4%	24.7%
Educators	62.2%	32.3%	3.0%
Interview a news source effectively and efficiently:			
Editors	24.2%	58.7%	16.5%
Educators	64.7%	28.7%	4.9%
Keep out of trouble with libel:			
Editors	23.1%	41.2%	35.7%
Educators	71.4%	23.2%	3.6%

(Continued on next page)

[b] "Don't know" responses have been omitted from the table. They vary from zero to 3.8%.

(Continued from previous page)

How well prepared are journalism graduates to	Very well prepared or well prepared	Somewhat prepared	Poorly or very poorly prepared
Cover city council meetings:			
Editors	25.3%	51.1%	23.1%
Educators	57.3%	34.1%	6.7%
Cover a court session:			
Editors	11.5%	47.3%	39.5%
Educators	48.8%	32.3%	17.1%
Cover a city budget story:			
Editors	4.9%	33.0%	61.0%
Educators	28.0%	50.6%	18.9%
Cover a political story, without bias:			
Editors	15.4%	51.1%	33.0%
Educators	56.1%	36.0%	5.5%
Cover a strike story, without bias:			
Editors	16.5%	45.1%	34.6%
Educators	47.0%	40.2%	9.8%
Cover a race riot story, without bias:			
Editors	12.0%	44.5%	37.9%
Educators	49.4%	36.6%	11.5%
Locate information in a reference library efficiently:			
Editors	31.9%	43.4%	24.2%
Educators	54.9%	35.4%	7.3%
Develop "enterprise" stories:			
Editors	20.3%	48.9%	30.8%
Educators	50.6%	40.2%	6.7%

In the responses to these first two questions by the sample components, there were no substantial differences between the "all editors" figures and those for the several circulation-group breakdowns. But in the educator sample, the administrators consistently rated the level of preparation of their graduates higher than did the professors. One illustrative example:

To Question 2, which asked "*How well do you think your graduates are prepared to. . .*" the two components in the educator sample responded in this fashion (the "don't know" responses are not reported):

	Very well or well prepared	Somewhat prepared	Poorly or very poorly prepared
Handle a copy-editing or head writing assignment:			
Administrators	84.4%	13.3%	—
Professors	66.4%	26.0%	5.9%
Cover a city budget story:			
Administrators	46.6%	44.4%	6.7%
Professors	21.0%	52.9%	23.5%

Two Views of Functions

Two additional questions in the study yielded responses complete enough to justify direct comparisons. One of the two dealt with some of the functions of a journalism education program, and the other dealt with some of the functions that are performed by newspapers.

Editors and educators were in agreement on the amount of emphasis that journalism schools ought to place on certain functions, while differing on others. Educators saw more need than did editors for journalism schools to provide consultant services to local publications, with or without compensation.

The question dealing with the functions of newspapers showed significant discrepancies between the views of editors and those of educators, with editors indicating a more idealized view of the way in which newspapers perform.

Question 3, in both versions, was: *To what extent do you think that a journalism school or department ought to:* followed by a list of seven activities. The answers are in table 3[a].

TABLE 3

Editors' and Educators' Opinions as to Whether the Schools Should Engage in Certain Activities

	A great deal or Quite a lot	Some	Little or Hardly any
Engage in analysis of the quality of the performance of the press generally:			
Editors	58.8%	29.7%	11.0%
Educators	87.2%	11.6%	1.2%
Engage in analysis of the quality of the performance of the local press:			
Editors	57.5%	28.6%	13.2%
Educators	80.5%	17.7%	1.8%

[a] "Don't know" responses have been omitted. They range from zero to 7.6%.

(Continued from previous page)

	A Great deal or quite a lot	Some	Little or Hardly any
Utilize local publications as teaching materials:			
Editors	75.3%	20.9%	2.7%
Educators	73.2%	22.6%	4.2%
Provide consultant help to local publications on request (with compensation):			
Editors	33.0%	38.5%	25.8%
Educators	51.2%	39.0%	7.9%
Provide consultant help to local publications (without compensation):			
Editors	6.6%	33.0%	52.8%
Educators	28.1%	45.1%	25.6%
Sponsor continuing education programs for active professionals:			
Editors	67.2%	24.2%	8.3%
Educators	68.9%	27.4%	2.4%
Utilize local newspaper staff members as part-time faculty:			
Editors	56.1%	31.9%	11.5%
Educators	31.1%	41.5%	27.4%

The responses to question 3 within the educator sample did not differ significantly between the administrator component and the professor component. Within the editor sample, there were no significant differences among the circulation categories, except that editors of papers with less than 25,000 circulation thought that less emphasis should be placed on the utilization of local publications as teaching materials than did their counterparts on larger papers.

Question 18 in the editors' version was: *Below are some of the functions that some people say are performed by newspapers. Please indicate the DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE you attach to these functions.* The educators' version was. . .*Please indicate YOUR OPINION of the DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE that NEWSPAPER EDITORS attach to these functions.* Responses are in Table 4[b].

[b] "Don't know" responses have been omitted. They range from 1.8% to 10%.

TABLE 4

Editors' and Educators' Evaluation of the Importance that Editors Attach to Certain Functions Performed by Newspapers

	A great deal or Quite a lot	Some	Little or Hardly any
Obtaining sufficient advertising revenue to be economically successful:			
Editors	93.3%	4.4%	0%
Educators	72.6%	18.9%	6.7%
Providing the reader with entertainment:			
Editors	35.2%	54.9%	5.5%
Educators	62.2%	32.9%	2.4%
Reporting news accurately and comprehensively:			
Editors	97.7%	0%	0%
Educators	79.9%	14.6%	3.6%
Influencing the formation of attitudes and opinions by readers:			
Editors	60.5%	29.7%	7.1%
Educators	39.6%	51.2%	7.3%
Fulfilling a watchdog role with respect to government, on behalf of the public:			
Editors	95.6%	2.2%	0%
Educators	54.3%	31.7%	12.2%
Furthering the objectives of a political party, candidate, or philosophy:			
Editors	4.9%	8.2%	82.9%
Educators	18.3%	42.1%	37.2%
Calling public attention to abuses or deficiencies in the social, economic or political structure of society:			
Editors	92.8%	5.0%	0%
Educators	38.4%	40.2%	19.5%
Upholding and enforcing existing values and standards of the community:			
Editors	41.8%	33.0%	20.3%
Educators	68.9%	20.7%	7.9%
Obtaining the maximum profits for your stockholders:			
Editors	27.4%	30.2%	32.4%
Educators	49.4%	23.8%	24.4%

Within the editor sample, the editors of papers with circulations of less than 25,000 tended to place less emphasis on providing the reader with entertainment, and on influ-

encing the formation of attitudes by readers, than did the editors of larger newspapers. Otherwise there were no significant differences among the responses in this sample. There were no significant differences between the responses from professors and those from administrators within the educator sample.

What Do They Study in Journalism Schools?

Several other questions in the study sought to determine what impression the respondents had as to the kinds of courses that are taken by students enrolled in journalism education programs.

Responses to these questions did not provide as valid a basis for comparisons of editors' and educators' attitudes as did the questions examined in earlier sections of this report. The proportion of "don't know" responses from editors was understandably a good deal higher than that from the educators. The data in this section of the report thus must be looked upon as providing only a rough basis for comparison. Even with this in mind, however, they do reveal some wide differences in the perceptions of the two respondent groups.

Question 5 was identical for both versions: *In the journalism ducation programs with which you are most familiar. what percentage of the student's total course load do you think is devoted to:* Responses are listed in table 5.

TABLE 5
Editors' and Educators' Perceptions of the Content of the School's Curriculum

What percentage of student's time is devoted to:

	0 to 19%	20 to 29%	30 to 39%	40% or more	Don't know
Courses in journalism:					
Editors	3.9%	30.8%	18.7%	28.0%	18.6%
Educators	3.0%	76.2%	12.8%	6.1%	1.9%

* * * * * *

	0 to 49%	50 to 59%	60 to 69%	70% or more	Don't know
Courses in liberal arts:					
Editors	32.4%	17.6%	20.3%	10.4%	19.3%
Educators	12.8%	11.0%	36.6%	36.0%	3.6%

(Continued on next page)

TABLE 5 *(Continued)*

What percentage of student's time is devoted to:

	0 to 9%	10 to 19%	20 to 29%	30% or more	Don't know
Related professional courses (art, business, etc.):					
Editors	12.6%	27.5%	26.4%	10.4%	23.1%
Educators	32.9%	35.4%	14.0%	3.7%	13.8%

The standards that a school or department must meet in order to earn accreditation from the American Council on Education for Journalism provide that the program for a student enrolled in journalism should include approximately 75 per cent liberal arts courses and 25 per cent journalism courses. Within the educator sample, the responses of the administrators (all heads of accredited programs) reflected this 75-25 breakdown almost exactly. The responses from the professors within the educator sample varied more widely. And the responses from the editors indicated a rather different impression of the content of a journalism education program from that reflected by the educators. Nearly a third of the editors indicated their belief that liberal arts courses make up less than 50 per cent of a journalism student's program, and 28 per cent of the editors indicated that journalism courses occupy more than 40 per cent of a journalism student's time.

If we eliminate from consideration the 18.6 per cent of editors who admitted they didn't know the proportion of journalism courses in the student's program, we find that, of these editors who claimed knowledge, 57.4 per cent believe that such courses constitute 30 per cent or more of the student's program. The same kind of computation shows that, of those editors who claim knowledge of the curriculum, 62 per cent think that liberal arts courses constitute less than 70 per cent of the student's program.

Question 9 was identical for both editors and educators: *These are some of the functions that some people have said should be performed by schools and departments of journalism. In the journalism education programs with which you are most familiar, HOW MUCH IMPORTANCE is attached to these functions:* The answers are in table 6.[a]

[a] "Don't know" responses have been omitted. They range from zero to 11.5%. Nearly all the "don't know" responses come from editors."

TABLE 6
Editors' and Educators' Evaluations of the Importance attached by the Schools to Certain Functions

How much importance is attached to:	Very great or great	Moderate	Little or Very little
Engaging in research to improve the newspaper product:			
Editors	8.2%	26.9%	56.0%
Educators	14.0%	25.6%	59.7%
Engaging in research to add to our knowledge of the processes and effects of mass communication:			
Editors	11.0%	30.8%	49.4%
Educators	26.8%	29.3%	43.3%
Teaching research method so that the student can make full use of the research mentioned in the two previous questions:			
Editors	7.7%	26.9%	55.5%
Educators	17.1%	32.3%	49.4%
Teaching reporting techniques, fact-gathering, evaluating:			
Editors	48.3%	36.3%	6.0%
Educators	77.5%	20.7%	1.8%
Teaching journalistic writing techniques:			
Editors	45.1%	36.3%	8.7%
Educators	79.8%	18.3%	1.9%
Teaching copy-editoring and makeup:			
Editors	28.6%	44.0%	18.7%
Educators	59.7%	33.5%	6.8%
Teaching law of the press:			
Editors	12.6%	46.7%	31.3%
Educators	52.4%	41.0%	6.6%
Teaching journalistic history:			
Editors	12.1%	44.5%	34.7%
Educators	33.6%	52.4%	14.0%

(Continued on next page)

(Continued from previous page)

TABLE 6
Editors' and Educators' Evaluations of the Importance attached by the Schools to Certain Functions

How much importance is attached to:	Very great or great	Moderate	Little or Very little
Teaching elements of advertising:			
Editors	4.4%	42.3%	41.8%
Educators	22.6%	38.4%	39.0%
Teaching typography and graphics:			
Editors	6.0%	40.1%	43.9%
Educators	12.8%	42.1%	45.1%
Teaching ethics of journalism with respect to the personal conduct of newsmen:			
Editors	15.4%	34.6%	40.6%
Educators	53.7%	34.1%	12.2%
Teaching ethics of journalism by analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of the press:			
Editors	14.3%	40.7%	35.7%
Educators	54.3%	34.8%	10.9%
Providing students with experience on campus publications:			
Editors	39.5%	30.8%	20.3%
Educators	40.2%	34.1%	25.7%
Providing students with internship experience on professional publications:			
Editors	30.2%	36.8%	24.7%
Educators	45.7%	37.8%	16.5%
Teaching communication theory and its application:			
Editors	22.5%	40.1%	28.1%
Educators	29.2%	42.7%	28.1%

Since editors sometimes complain that journalism educators are too preoccupied with communication theory and research, it might have been expected that the responses from educators and editors would have differed widely on questions such as the last four in the set included in question 9, dealing with the degree of emphasis placed on research and theory in journalism education programs. Yet the responses

to these four questions do not show as much divergence in the views of the two groups as is evident on other items in the set. And where differences do appear, it is usually the educators, not the editors, who indicate the greater importance of research.

Still another question dealing with the nature and quality of journalism education programs, as these factors are perceived by the two respondent groups, was designed to get a measurement in terms of comparisons with other fields of education. Although there were substantial "don't know" responses from both groups, the educators -- closer to the scene -- were readier than the editors to make specific comparisons.

Question 4 was the same for both groups: *How do you think that programs in journalism education compare in terms of excellence and professionalism with programs in:* Five other fields of education were listed for comparison. The comparisons are shown in Table 7.

TABLE 7
Journalism Education Programs Compared with Other Education Programs: By Editors and Educators

	Journalism programs are:			
	Much better or Better than	The Same as	Poorer or Much poorer than	Don't know
Business education:				
Editors	12.1%	42.9%	27.5%	17.5%
Educators	51.8%	35.4%	6.7%	6.1%
Medical Education:				
Editors	1.1%	8.2%	73.6%	17.1%
Educators	4.9%	22.6%	65.2%	7.3%
Teacher Education:				
Editors	22.5%	37.4%	22.6%	17.5%
Educators	71.9%	17.7%	4.3%	6.1%
Legal Education:				
Editors	2.2%	13.7%	66.5%	17.6%
Educators	8.5%	36.0%	47.7%	7.8%
Engineering Education:				
Editors	1.7%	14.3%	66.4%	17.6%
Educators	15.3%	44.5%	33.0%	7.2%

Within the educator sample, administrators tended to rate journalism education more favorably in comparison with

other fields than did the professors. No significant differences were evident in the responses of the several circulation groups in the editor sample.

Respondents in both groups pointed out that their evaluations could not be regarded as precise since the fields being compared are dissimilar in many respects.

Where Are the Priorities Placed?

Another set of questions was designed to obtain an impression of the respondents' views about the ways in which journalism faculty members are selected and promoted, and about the way in which the time of journalism faculty members is allocated among various functions.

The editors' responses to these questions included -- again understandably -- very substantial "don't know" components. Thus the picture of this aspect of journalism education as seen by the editors is visible in only rough outlines. Comparisons between the views of the editors and those of the educators is even less feasible with this set of responses than with those in the immediately preceding section.

Question 13 was identical for editors and educators: *In the journalism education programs with which you are most familiar, how much weight do you think is given to the following factors in selecting new faculty members:* The answers are in Table 8.

TABLE 8
Criteria Used in Selecting Faculty Members, as Perceived by Editors and Educators

What weight do schools give to:	Very great or great	Moderate	Little or Very little	Don't know
Professional media experience:				
Editors	15.4%	35.2%	32.4%	17.0%
Educators	66.5%	26.2%	6.1%	1.2%
Master's degree:				
Editors	64.3%	15.4%	1.7%	18.6%
Educators	66.4%	15.9%	13.4%	4.3%
Doctor's degree:				
Editors	56.6%	19.8%	6.1%	17.5%
Educators	70.1%	22.0%	6.7%	1.2%
Teaching ability:				
Editors	14.8%	46.2%	18.1%	20.9%
Educators	45.7%	31.8%	21.3%	1.2%
Scholarly books and research articles candidate has published:				
Editors	35.2%	25.8%	16.0%	23.0%
Educators	38.4%	47.0%	13.5%	1.1%

Question 15 was also identical for editors and educators: *In the journalism education programs with which you are familiar, how much weight do you think is given to the following factors when a faculty member's promotion is being considered:* The answers are in Table 9.

TABLE 9

Criteria Used in Promoting Faculty Members, As perceived by Editors and Educators

What weight do schools give to:	Very great or great	Moderate	Little or Very little	Don't know
Teaching ability:				
Editors	20.3%	37.9%	11.6%	30.2%
Educators	48.2%	31.1%	18.9%	1.8%
Research accomplishment (books, articles published):				
Editors	43.4%	23.1%	5.6%	27.9%
Educators	64.7%	28.0%	6.1%	1.2%
Actual experience on newspapers:				
Editors	8.8%	26.4%	37.9%	26.9%
Educators	22.0%	43.3%	32.9%	1.8%
Popularity with students:				
Editors	15.9%	37.4%	15.4%	31.3%
Educators	26.3%	40.2%	30.5%	3.0%
Service to the field (speeches to press meetings, etc.):				
Editors	21.4%	27.5%	22.5%	28.6%
Educators	18.3%	46.3%	33.5%	1.9%
Professional writing for newspapers, magazines (not research reports):				
Editors	19.8%	26.9%	24.2%	29.1%
Educators	14.0%	43.3%	40.2%	2.5%

Within the editor sample, there were no important differences in the responses to these two questions from the several circulation sample components. But there were more substantial differences between the administrator and professor sub-samples, and these differences were in some respects more interesting than those between the two major samples. For example, the responses to question 13, asking about the weight given to various criteria *when new faculty members were selected*, showed these variations: [a]

[a] "Don't know" responses have been omitted. They range from zero to 1.6%.

	Very Great or Great	Moderate	Little or Very Little
Professional media experience:			
Administrators	82.1%	15.6%	2.3%
Professors	60.5%	30.3%	7.6%
Doctor's degree:			
Administrators	62.1%	31.1%	6.8%
Professors	73.1%	18.5%	6.8%
Teaching ability:			
Administrators	64.3%	24.4%	11.3%
Professors	38.7%	34.5%	25.2%

And Question 15, asking for similar estimates of the weight given to various criteria *when a faculty member's promotion is being considered*, yielded the following responses:

	Very Great or Great	Moderate	Little or Very Little
Teaching ability:			
Administrators	71.1%	20.0%	8.9%
Professors	39.5%	35.3%	22.7%
Actual experience on newspapers:			
Administrators	37.7%	46.6%	15.7%
Professors	15.9%	42.0%	39.4%

Question 11, asked of both samples, was: *In the journalism education programs with which you are most familiar, what amount of his overall working time do you think the typical faculty member devotes to the following activities:* The answers are in Table 10.

TABLE 10

Time That Faculty Members Devote to Various Activities as Estimated by Editors and Educators

	A great deal or Quite a lot	Some	Little or Hardly any	Don't know
Classroom teaching, including preparation:				
Editors	51.1%	20.3%	1.7%	26.9%
Educators	87.8%	9.1%	2.4%	.7%
Correcting and criticizing student work:				
Editors	40.2%	30.2%	3.8%	25.8%
Educators	88.0%	9.8%	1.8%	.4%

(Continued on next page)

[a]The omitted "don't know" responses range from zero to 2.7%.

(Continued from preceding page)

TABLE 10

	A great deal or Quite a lot	Some	Little or Hardly any	Don't know
Engaging in research in his field:				
Editors	11.2%	30.8%	29.6%	26.4%
Educators	14.1%	41.5%	43.3%	1.1%
Advising students individually:				
Editors	18.1%	37.9%	17.5%	26.5%
Educators	71.4%	24.4%	3.6%	.6%
Keeping up on papers, magazines, books, in his field:				
Editors	30.8%	30.8%	10.4%	28.0%
Educators	57.9%	35.4%	6.1%	.6%
Maintaining contacts with professionals in his field:				
Editors	13.7%	33.5%	26.4%	26.5%
Educators	28.7%	57.9%	12.2%	1.2%
Attending meetings of scholarly associations:				
Editors	25.3%	27.5%	17.1%	30.1%
Educators	17.1%	47.6%	36.6%	.7%
Attending meetings of professional associations:				
Editors	18.7%	33.0%	19.9%	28.4%
Educators	22.6%	47.0%	29.9%	.5%
Updating his own professional skills:				
Editors	7.6%	31.9%	31.3%	29.2%
Educators	14.6%	44.5%	39.7%	1.2%

As was noted earlier, the editors' version of the questionnaire contained two items not included in the educators' version. One provided space for the editor to indicate the circulation size of his paper. The other read: *Focusing on a particular journalism educator in your state with whom you are well acquainted, how valuable do you think he would be as a consultant to you in improving the editorial content and/or makeup of your paper?* The responses were as follows: [a]

[a] "Don't know" percentages ranged from 1.5% to 4.9%.

	Very Valuable or Valuable	Moderately helpful	Little Help or No Help
All editors	26.4%	41.2%	29.6%
Editors (100,000+)	19.4%	34.3%	44.8%
Editors (25,000 to 100,000)	29.0%	47.6%	18.5%
Editors (under 25,000)	34.5%	37.9%	27.6%

APPENDIX

Comments From Respondents

At the close of the survey questionnaire, a space was provided for respondents to append comments. Many respondents noted explanatory additions to the checked table responses as they moved through the questionnaire (for example, a number of respondents - both editors and educators - pointed out that their estimates of how well students were prepared referred to averages and approximations, and noted that individual students would vary widely from well-prepared to poorly-prepared in any given class in any given school.)

But a surprisingly large number of respondents (70 out of the total 355) took the trouble to make summary comments at the end of the printed questionnaire. These ranged from a paragraph to several single-spaced pages in length, and nearly all of them came from editors.

(The most elaborate supplementary contribution came from Ralph Sewell of the *Daily Oklahoman* and *Times* of Oklahoma City, who collected responses to the entire questionnaire from 10 recent journalism graduates now on the staffs of his papers.)

It was obviously not possible to include the whole of the respondents' comments in this report. Many, of course, were repetitive to some degree. But some representative excerpts have been grouped under several topic headings below.

Comments on Journalism Education

"Too many journalism schools have become departments of 'communications' with something for everybody and newspaper journalism assuming a minor role in some. There is no substitute for lots of study in the arts and sciences, an urge to read and read, and to write and write and write, if one wishes to become a good newspaperman." - *Editor, 100,000+*

"The curse of journalism education is the majority of U.S. journalism schools where no research is done and the teaching, being based on the practices of 30 years ago, is worthless. The professors are no more eager to update their skills than they are motivated to find out what's happening in their fields."*Professor*

"If a journalism department is basically aimed at turning out journalism teachers, the students should be so informed at the outset. If it stresses press criticism, with a concommitant contempt for the local rags, the student should be warned that he is preparing for a career as press critic, not as a reporter-newsman-editor. . . Journalism departments are frequently afflicted with the same problems as the news outlets they co-exist with. For example, the journalism professor with tenure and the reporter with Guild job security are equally likely to have their best years behind them. Or, just as some newspapers become dominated by executives who came up on the advertising side, so do some journalism schools become dominated by professors of advertising. . . Professionally, the journalism professors who belittle journalists just for the hell of it are, in effect, belittling the study of journalism as well. And the editor who criticizes journalism professors as 'those who can't do, teach' is injuring one of his last friends in the academic world." - *Editor, 100,000+*

"Most of the journalism educators in my state couldn't hold down a job on our paper. Many of them have tried and failed. There are, of course, a *few* exceptions." - *Editor, 100,000+*

"I am not at all certain that there is any value in undergraduate schools of journalism. Graduate programs, such as Columbia's, which emphasize the practical rather than the theoretical aspects of journalism are, I believe, helpful both to the student and the profession." - *Editor, less than 25,000.*

"I deplore the activism shown by some faculty members and their zealous promotion of advocacy reporting." - *Editor, 25,000 to 100,000.*

"It seems to me that as long as teachers stay in schools and work and talk only with teachers, and that as long as professionals work and talk only with professionals, the theory and practice of journalism will be separated by an impenetrable wilderness of ignorance and indifference. After

all, journalism schools 'manufacture' a 'product' which the communications industry is expected to use. I'm not saying it's a bad product. I do think it could be improved on, not by one-way interchange, but by a two-way interchange. If the irreverent Agnews are here, can the relevant Naders be far behind?" - *Editor, 25,000 to 100,000.*

"I feel that in an attempt to be more 'academic,' too many journalism schools are downplaying the role and importance of newsgathering and newswriting. . .If journalism isn't gathering, writing and editing the news - intelligently and conscientiously and with a sense of perspective - what is it?. . .In an effort to satisfy the academic types at higher echelons. . .the pressure is put on faculty members to 1) get a Ph.D. and 2) research and publish (no matter how insignificant). . .At promotion time, the bright Ph.D. with his 3 articles in JQ and 2 years in a newsroom gets a leg up, while the M.A. with 13 years in newsrooms and an interest in helping young people prepare for a career as working newsmen will forever remain an instructor or assistant prof." - *Professor*

"The newspaper industry is changing, but the journalism faculties are not keeping up. Faculty members must come down from their ivy-covered ivory towers and find out what's happening in the business." *Editor, 25,000 to 100,000.*

"Somewhere along the line most journalism schools seem to have forgotten their basic function - to teach students the art of communicating the realities of life around them to the people who need to know. Most schools of journalism even when they have a strong liberal arts background and orientation, don't relate the subjects taught in school to the real life of the newspaper. And that's basically why most newspapers and other communications media have failed miserably to tell the developing trends, the social movements, the real pressures of modern society to their readers." - *Editor,25,000 to 100,000.*

"All of the above answers have been influenced by a strong opinion that journalism faculties become isolated from the working world of journalism. . .I fear that the preoccupation of faculty with critical analysis of the press has undermined the confidence of students in the potential for good in the press and has destroyed their zeal and replaced it with cynicism." - *Editor,25,000 to 100,000*

Comments on Qualifications of Graduates

"Journalism schools tend to place too much emphasis on the importance and influence of the larger, metro daily and appear to be grooming their students for employment on that type of publication. The fact of the matter is that no less than 75 per cent of daily newspapers today are in the 25,000 or under circulation class and it is in this area that exists the greatest opportunity for beginning journalists whether in the news or business end." - *Editor, under 25,000.*

"Too damned much theory and far too much activist methodology. The press is in great danger at the hands of demagogues everywhere, while the nation's journalism schools are training more generations of demagogues, even more dangerous because they 'honestly' do not understand the function for a free press. - *Editor, 100,000+*

"When you ask if a journalism school graduate has a complete understanding of objectivity in reporting I have to answer very much indeed. What the question does not ask is whether he is prepared to apply that objectivity. Many activist-oriented young people believe strongly that objectivity is the wrong approach." - *Editor, 25,000 to 100,000.*

"Traditionally, copy-editing and makeup seem to get linked as though they were ham and eggs. The assumption has always been - in the newspaper business and in journalism schools - that if you could edito copy and write headlines you could fit type into a page, after you learned a few helpful cliches about 'anchors', 'tombstones', 'corner stress', etc. Copy-editing is practiced best by persons having a high degree of language skill; it is an art in itself. Makeup is quite another art with quite a different frame of reference, one which is more closely allied with painting and drawing; in short, in the language of artists, the arrangement of elements on a flat surface. If one will admit the validity of makeup as being an artist's province, then with few exceptions one will concurrently admit that few journalism professors are equipped to teach makeup. The sad part of it is that journalism professors, not artists, do teach makeup." - *Editor, 25,000 to 100,000.*

"As a graduate of one of the country's better journalism schools I feel comfortable (and sad) in saying that most recent journalism graduates I've seen don't know much about newspapering and don't realize that they don't know much.

They come out bursting with idealism and ill-equipped to cope with the hard work and monotony of the business. Many are so disillusioned that they quit in a very short time. . .I haven't seen many faculty members who could cut it on a good daily newspaper. They're hiding from reality, I fear, and wondering why their prize students aren't setting the world afire after graduation. The truth is that their prize students are as ill-prepared as the faculty members." - *Editor, 25,000 to 100,000.*

"As the newsroom training director of a 200,000 circulation paper which publishes seven days a week, I have found many journalism school graduates who have, sadly, totally inadequate education and background for newspaper jobs. Some of our trainees -- and they are hand-picked and considered the best of what is available -- have had to be taught basic grammar, spelling, verb tenses, etc. . . The unfortunate fact is many journalism graduates simply cannot write a concise account of something that happened, or of an event that is to happen. Neither can they edit a piece of copy, nor do they have more than an illusory idea of what goes on in the mechanical departments. And they apparently have not been taught to work rapidly." - *Editor, 100,000+*

"Those of us who have observed the trends in the 'new journalism', with all its excesses of advocacy, recognize a basic lack of appreciation among many emerging journalists of the historical and constitutional role and responsibilities of the American Press. It's as if young doctors were emerging from medical school without any awareness of the Hippocratic Oath." - *Editor, 100,000+*

"Apparently leaders in the field of journalism education fail to realize that a high percentage of their graduates go immediately into positions of responsibility greater than that of just reporting and have immediate need of some other basic knowledge and skill." - *Editor, less than 25,000.*

"Journalism schools, generally, are not producing superior reporting candidates. I strongly believe that with rare exceptions, journalism school instructors are not sufficiently 'news' oriented. . .We don't need lecturers - we need reporters! We don't need writers - we need reporters! Educator types have for the past ten years insisted that what our readers want is 'interpretive writing'. Our readers want straight reporting. They get the news interpreted by mature,

qualified reporters on the editorial page." - *Editor 25,000 to 100,000.*

Comments on the Study Itself

"I'm exhausted. No questionnaire should be this long." - *Editor, 100,000+*

"I think this questionnaire is on a par with most others that I have seen dealing with 'expectations'. It's asinine. . .As in most questionnaires of the 'check one' variety, this one leaves a great deal to be desired, and is hardly likely to serve any purpose other than the usual one - to draw some kind of mathematical chart." - *Editor, 25,000 to 100,000.*

"This is one of the dozens of questionnaires I've seen on this topic. It is the best I've seen." - *Editor, 25,000 to 100,000.*

"How the dead hand of the past inspires this question! (dealing with emphasis placed on various journalistic theory and technique courses.) E.g.: we are still teaching people to hand-stick type but our students never learn what's happening in the communications/electronic revolution going on right now and shaping the future they have to live with. The question is not *how much*, but *what* (we teach)."- *Professor.*

"In my opinion your questionnaire indicates a bias in that 'typography and graphics' does not sufficiently denote or connote visual and nonverbal communication concepts and methods (radio, television, information communication are under-represented by these terms). . .On the whole, I believe most schools and departments fail to give proper emphasis to visual and and other nonverbal communication channels and (especially) do not effectively integrate the visual and nonverbal into all pertinent courses." - *Professor.*

"The most sense-making questionnaire I've seen on this subject." - *Professor.*

Relationship of Educators and Newsmen

"Question 19 is concerned with journalism educators acting as consultants to newspapers. As managing editor of a newspaper in a university city, I have always found my frequent sessions with the journalism faculty of the university to be provocative. I would say the same thing about those journalism educators I have met and talked to at professional meetings in other places in the United States. . .The questionnaire hardly offers an opportunity to hint at an expression of the idea of interchanges working from professional back into the schools. The flow is strongly from the schools into the

professional field. Question 19 strongly states the interchange idea, again, working from the schools into the professional field as a consultant. It might have had several more parts to it. One part could have been devoted to soliciting thoughts on how best to get theorists into the profession, as consultants, yes, but more importantly, for refreshers. Another part could have dealt with the idea of making use of qualified professionals as teachers." - *Editor, 25,000 to 100,000.*

"There is a tendency among young graduates to be advocates. This has been true for many years, and J-Schools must not be expected to try to curb this tendency. Editors have the function of directing the energy of idealism (bias) into good reporting." - *Editor, 25,000 to 100,000.*

"This is a two-way street, of course. There is a need for much more interplay between newspapers and journalism educators. Newspaper executives should make it a point to know a good deal about journalism programs in area colleges and universities, and to know the people running these programs. The educators should be assured by ACTION of the newspapers that the professional press is vitally interested in these programs. They should know that newspapers are willing to help in any way possible in college programs. By action. On the other hand, journalism educators should know a good deal about newspapers and newsmen in their area. I have talked with journalism educators on several occasions lately. I have begged them to come down and see us. They are always welcome. I have not seen a journalism educator in our office in a long time." - *Editor, 100,000+*

"I think editors are remiss about not observing J. Schools from time to time. I'm guilty, too. We should make time to spend on campuses." - *Editor, 25,000 to 100,000.*

Two Questions Posed by the Hulteng Survey
By Chilton R. Bush

By implication, at least two questions are posed by the Hulteng survey. The first question emerges from editors' and the second from educators' responses.

1. Table 2 shows the editors' very low evaluations of the writing, reporting and editing skills learned by the graduates. The data do not show clearly whether or not editors *expect* the graduates to be highly skilled. Proficiency in these skills can be developed only by the school requiring considerable practice. Adequate competency can be acquired only by

reducing the proportion of time the undergraduate student can devote to nonprofessional courses, mainly the liberal arts.

We can affirm the propositions that knowledge of the substantive nonprofessional fields make the graduate a better newspaper man *in the long run* and that competency in journalistic skills at the time of graduation makes the graduate a competent *beginner.* If both propositions are true, then each editor needs to ask himself which of the two kinds of graduate he prefers to hire.

2. Educators' responses to some of the questions in Tables 6, 8 and 9 seem to be contradictory. Educators attribute very little importance to the teacher engaging in research to improve the newspaper product and to add to our knowledge of the process and effects of mass communication (Table 6). Yet, as shown in Tables 8 and 9, which report the criteria used for selecting and promoting faculty members, educators attribute great importance to research accomplishments and possession of the Ph.D. degree.

This is the dilemma which faces the schools–at least those in the leading universities: to hire and promote teachers with adequate professional experience or teachers with competence in research method who have minimal or no professional experience.

It is a truism in higher education that "one cannot be a good teacher unless he engages in research." One translation: "A good teacher is one who has intellectual curiosity, who is original and who tests the new hypotheses that come to his mind in the course of his teaching and reading." Another translation: "A teacher who does not engage in research goes on for years teaching from old notes and comes to be regarded by his colleagues and students as 'deadwood.'"

In recent years, many of the leading universities have insisted that schools of journalism use the same criteria for employing and promoting faculty members that the other departments of instruction use. Under those conditions, the school of journalism is compelled to search for a man who not only has some years of graduate education but also some years of professional experience. This has proved to be a considerable handicap for the schools in the top universities, and the requirement seems to be extending to the lesser universities.

END

DEPT.OF HEALTH EDUCATION AND WELFARE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION ERIC DATE FILMED

2 26 74